



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the result of a sale under a prior writ; and in the last case had it returned with the endorsement that no property other than that attached could be found, erroneously supposing that would be necessary to enable him to maintain the bill in equity as a creditor, in which suit the objection was made.

One case is found which seems to sustain the holding that by ordering the first execution returned the lien of the attachment judgment was abandoned. While that case was pending the term of the sheriff who levied the attachment had expired. The first execution was given to the new sheriff. Probably the creditor then discovered the cases in which it has been held that the officer who begins executing process must complete it, and that the execution on the attachment judgment must be executed by the old sheriff, though out of office. See *McKay v. Harrower* (1858), 27 Barb. 463. At all events he ordered the new sheriff to return the writ unsatisfied without making any levy, which was done. A new execution was then taken out and given to the old sheriff, who proceeded under it to sell the attached lumber in his hands. The defendant's assignee thereupon brought an action for the possession of the lumber; and the court held that the new sheriff could and should have executed the first writ, and that by ordering it returned the attaching creditor had abandoned it. *Butler v. White* (1879), 25 Minn. 432.

RECENT IMPORTANT DECISIONS

ADMINISTRATOR—DEBT DUE FROM HIM TO THE ESTATE—EFFECT OF ADMINISTRATOR'S INSOLVENCY.—One who was indebted to an intestate, was appointed administrator of his estate. On final accounting, he asked to be discharged without paying the debt, on showing that he was at the time of his appointment, and has since been, entirely insolvent. *Held*, that upon such a showing he was entitled to be discharged without paying the debt. *In re Howell's Estate* (1902),—Neb.—, 92 N. W. Rep. 760.

It was conceded that the Massachusetts rule was to the contrary effect and that certain other states had adopted it. See *CROSWELL EX'RS AND ADM'R'S* §§ 485, 534. But it was insisted that "the later cases hold that where the administrator or executor is shown to have been insolvent at the time of his appointment, during the incumbency of his office, and at the time of his discharge, his bondsmen are not liable for his individual debt," citing *In re Walker's Estate*, 125 Cal. 242, 57 Pac. 991, 73 Am. St. Rep. 40; *Baucus v. Slover*, 89 N. Y. 1, 107 id. 624, 13 N. E. 938; *Keegan v. Smith*, 39 N. Y. Supple. 826; *In re Georgi*, 47 N. Y. Supple. 1061; *McCarty v. Frazer*, 62 Mo. 263; *Harker v. Irick*, 10 N. J. Eq. 269; *Rader v. Yeargin*, 85 Tenn. 486, 3 S. W. 178; *State v. Gregory*, 119 Ind. 503, 22 N. E. 1; *Condit v. Winslow*, 106 Ind. 142, 5 N. E. 751; *Griffith v. Chew*, 8 Serg. & R. 17, 11 Am. Dec. 556; *Tarbell v. Jewitt*, 129 Mass. 457; *Lyon v. Osgood*, 58 Vt. 707, 7 Atl. 5.

AGENCY—ACTION BY UNDISCLOSED PRINCIPAL—ABTRACTER'S LIABILITY FOR DEFECTIVE ABSTRACT.—Plaintiff desiring to borrow money upon a mortgage upon real estate, applied to a firm of money-loaners, and delivered to them his abstract of title which they were to have corrected to date. The firm sent the abstract in their own names to defendant, an abstracter of title,